Africa - North

Johnston, H.H.

FRANCE IN NORTH AFRICA.

Now that France has become so deeply involved in the affairs of Morocco, while on the eastern and south-eastern frontiers of her African Empire she is troubled and perplexed by a revival of Turkish power, it may be as well to pass in review her position in North Africa, the work which she has achieved there since 1830, and the claims on the gratitude and consideration of Europe which she may have acquired by her eighty-one years' labours in North Africa. My qualifications for attempting this task are, that I have travelled in Algeria at intervals since 1879, that at one time and another I have visited all parts of Tunisia and something of Tripoli, that I know Egypt pretty well, and have recently returned from a journey into the eastern parts of Morocco.

French ambitions in regard to African dominion date from the end of the Crusades, from the landing of Louis IX at Carthage. This best of French kings might have succeeded with his project of conquering Tunis, as an additional bulwark of the Angevin Kingdom of Sicily and Naples, had it not been for the outbreak of the plague, from which he died, amid the ruins still standing of the Roman capital of Roman Africa. Under the reign of Francis I the bold plan was adopted (copied by Queen Elizabeth in the latter part of the same sixteenth century) of an alliance with the Turk and the Moslem, in consequence of which French fishermen and merchants acquired a better footing in the commerce of Algeria, Tunis, and Egypt.[1] Louis XIV developed distinct designs on Egypt and Abyssinia owing to the reports which he received from French consuls and travellers as to the weakness of the Mamluk government of the Nile Valley. Although his projects came to nought, they did not die away completely, but gave birth in the second half of the eighteenth century to the exploring journey of Sonnini, a young Alsatian traveller patronised by Buffon. French designs on Egypt finally bore fruit in the great expedition of Napoleon Bonaparte, who by landing at Alexandria with 40,000 men in 1798 really began the modern European scramble for African dominion.

[1] From this period dates the establishment of the French at La Calle in Eastern Algeria, their first foothold on the North African coast.

The vital importance of Egypt to British schemes of empire over Southern Asia (together with the possession on the part of Great Britain of the requisite sea power to enforce her purposes) brought about the French withdrawal from Egypt. But the Napoleonic invasion of that country with the marvellous past achieved immense good, and was followed by 110 years of Egyptological research. It also resulted in the tracing of the Nile to its source and the eventual redemption of Egypt and the Egyptian Sudan from the appalling devastation caused by the anarchical rule of Moslem Turks, Arabs, Kurds, Circassians, Greeks and Nubians.

The destruction of the French Navy during the Napoleonic wars brought France into contempt amongst the corsairs of the Barbary States. The worst phase of North African piracy had arisen early in the sixteenth century, in an attempt of the Barbary States and their allies, the Turks, to repel the attacks of Spain on North Africa and to avenge the expulsion of the Moors from Spain. But during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the beginning of the nineteenth, these corsairs, not content with attacking the coasts and the commerce of the Spanish Peninsula, extended their piracies into the Irish and British Channels, ravaged the coasts of Italy (usually without any provocation at all), and even molested the commerce of the United States when that Power achieved independence. By 1818, Great Britain, Holland, and the United States had practically ensured respect for their flags, their commerce, and their citizens on the part of Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli; but France was still openly flouted by the Algerines and Moors, since the Turkish Deys and Beys of the Algerian coast and the Sultan of Morocco believed that France had not got the requisite naval strength to punish their insolence, and that no other European Power would champion the French cause (though Great Britain came to its assistance in 1819). Consequently, petty attacks on French shipping continued after the Napoleonic wars were over, and French consuls were treated with scant respect. The immediate cause of the French quarrel with Algiers was the refusal of the French monarchical government to repay to two Jewish citizens of Algiers the balance of a debt due for the supply of corn to the French Directory in 1796. This refusal led to quarrels between the Dey and the French Consul (besides disputes as to the subsidy due for and the right to fortify the French fishing and trading stations on the Algerian coast), and so by degrees to the final rupture in 1829 and the strong expedition sent by the Government of Charles X to attack Algiers in June, 1830.

No doubt this expedition was determined on with a view to restoring the prestige of the French monarchy by a display of

military and naval strength in the Mediterranean, but it is incorrect to suppose that the French Government had no ulterior objects at that time. It is clear that the loss of Egypt rankled, and that under the pretext of chastising an independent Turkish prince, an attempt was going to be made to establish France on the opposite side of the Mediterranean, if such a project could be carried out without provoking Great Britain to war. The fall of Charles X's Government in July 1830 only slightly arrested the prosecution of the French plans; because although the French Government under Louis Philippe professed to be carrying out merely temporary measures in North Africa and to be ready to negotiate with Great Britain for withdrawal, nevertheless by the close of 1830 the French had taken possession of all the leading seaports of Algeria between the frontiers of Tunis and Morocco.

The liberal government of Louis Philippe being viewed sympathetically in England, British opposition to a French North African Empire relaxed, and by 1834 the French Government had deliberately assumed the responsibility for conquering and administering Algeria from the Mediterranean to the Sahara. In 1844 the insolent power of Morocco received a short, sharp, and wholesome lesson, and never again seriously attempted any interference in Algeria. Thenceforth and until 1904 only the opposition of Great Britain and of Spain stood between France and a conquest of Morocco. Great Britain also extended some kind of protection over Tunis until the Berlin Congress of 1878.

The British occupation of Cyprus, Egypt, and the Egyptian Sudan, together with the establishment of a protectorate over the eastern half of Nigeria, led inevitably to a relaxation of British jealousy in regard to Tunisia and Morocco, and to various agreements by which Great Britain withdrew her opposition to the extension of French interests in those countries, and agreed with France in ignoring the claims of Turkey to exercise any political rule beyond the southern frontiers of Tripoli, Fezzan, and Barka.[2] Consequently, in 1904, by that agreement with Great Britain which recognised the privileged position of the United Kingdom in Egypt and the Egyptian Sudan, France believed herself to have (with the mental reservation of Italian aspirations in Tripoli and Spanish claims to the Riff coast of Morocco) a very free hand over North and North Central Africa; from Wadai and Bagirmi on the south-east, to the Atlantic coast on the west, and the Mediterranean on the north. The curious diplomatic trick by which Germany—when Britain and France were on bad terms—had first obtained from Great Britain a free hand on the Upper Benue and the Shari, and had then made use of this recognition

[2] For the simple reason that no such rule had ever been exercised either by Turkey or by her Egyptian or Tripolitan vassals.

of German rights to admit France to the Upper Benue and Lake Chad, inspired the French (combined with other indications) with the idea that Germany viewed with approval the creation of this huge empire in Africa as a pledge of peace, and an indication that France had tacitly turned her back on Alsace-Lorraine and would devote all her energies, wealth, and military strength to the creation of a vast French dominion over the northern half of Africa.

But there was a rude awakening for both France and Britain when the German Imperial Government insisted on the retirement of M. Delcassé, and by the special visit of the Emperor in the spring of 1905 gave an almost aggressive German recognition to the independence of Morocco.

The Conference of Algeciras in 1906 patched up an arrangement which saved the face of Germany, admitted to some extent the claims of France and Spain to interfere in the affairs of Morocco, and yet tied the hands of France very effectually in regard to the absorption within her own dominion of this most unruly Berber State. The Balkan crisis of 1909, provoked by another advance of Austro-Germany in the inevitable march to the Ægean Sea, led to a relaxation of stringency in regard to French operations in Morocco: indeed, in most organs of the French Press it was believed in 1909 that Germany had handed over Morocco to France in return for a free hand in the Nearer East. But this apparently was not the case: neither Power had committed itself very far in either direction. France now finds herself awkwardly situated in Morocco. The cruel, misgoverning Sultan deserves little commiseration; nor need we waste overmuch pity on his unruly and unwilling subjects, who are madly fanatical against the Christian European, pitilessly cruel, tribe against tribe, warped and spoilt by twelve centuries of civil war. To preserve her position in North Africa France is obliged to interfere in Morocco, and Germany (if I may crystallise vague threats into plain facts) obliges France to play the *rôle* in Morocco of the Sultan's ally and supporter. Far and away the best thing for Morocco and the people of Morocco at the present day would be the distinct and clear establishment of a French protectorate and the reduction of the Sultan to the same position as that now (honourably) occupied by the Bey of Tunis. Then, indeed, the country would go ahead. Its native population would increase by leaps and bounds, its incalculable natural riches be thrown open to commerce, while science would gain prodigiously by the examination of wonderful monuments of the past stretching back into far distant ages of pre-history. There would be revelations of a palæontological fauna which would almost rival that of the Himalayan foothills; there would be fresh discoveries in botany,

in living zoology, and the evolution of human races, which would exceed in interest anything yet made known by the French in Algeria and Tunis. Yet Germany not only bars the way, but is said to have incited Spain to claim more than her fair proportion of intervention in Northern Morocco, and possibly even to forestal the French in opening-up railway communication with Fez, the real capital of the Moorish Empire. Meantime, and until Germany and France can come to an understanding, the good days of Morocco are delayed.

Of course, Germany is right to act in what she believes to be the best interests of the German Empire. Germans in official positions with whom one may discuss this question will point out, with some bitterness, that France deals with North Africa on very different lines to those adopted by the United Kingdom in regard to India and all British possessions controlled in any way from London. The commercial policy of the French Government between Tunis and the Morocco frontier is one of protection for French subjects, so as not only to give them an unfair advantage in trade, but—since French capital does not enter North Africa very enthusiastically—to lock up the development of the resources of Algeria and Tunis in a somewhat dog-in-the-manger fashion : whereas, if this policy of protection, these differential duties and undue favour to French *concessionnaires* came to an end, there would be an enormous development of German commerce throughout North Africa. In regard to Algeria and Tunis Germany has nothing to say, since the present arrangements were recognised or not disputed by her many years ago : but she is loath to give up what claims she may possess to equality of treatment in Morocco, without either marked compensation in other parts of the world or some clear understanding with France that if the French flag is to wave over Morocco the whole of that country is nevertheless to enjoy a free trade *régime* quite different to what prevails in Algeria and Tunis. 'Then,' say the Germans, 'under the protection of the French flag we can perhaps become the strongest commercial Power in Morocco. We believe in that country and in its resources, and Germans prove to be very successful there as commercial agents.'

On the other hand, those forces which are behind the French Government in the commercial world of France still dislike very strongly the abandonment of protection for French interests. They ask why France should go to the great expense in men and money of conquering and administering Morocco, and maintaining law and order in Algeria and Tunis, mainly for the benefit of the commerce of other nations. They declare that if the present restrictions in Algeria and Tunis were not in force (and as regards Tunis they would like these restrictions strengthened and amplified

when existing commercial treaties come to an end) the bulk of the commerce would not be French, but would be British and Maltese, Italian or German.[3]

So far as Great Britain is concerned, she has for a very apparent compensation elsewhere surrendered any claims she may possess to free trade in North Africa. She has done so in regard to Algeria and Tunis, and is, no doubt, pledged to do so in Morocco if France succeeds in becoming with the assent of Europe the predominant power in that country. Yet in spite of this abandonment of British claims to free-trade treatment, mark how the trade of the British Empire with Algeria and Tunis has increased since the establishment of French dominion over those countries, and in spite of the preferences accorded to French trade. Our commerce might have multiplied with these countries at an even greater rate under a free-trade *régime*; still, we may be grateful for and sensible of the fact that it does so well under existing conditions,[4] and we are entitled to surmise that it will not fare badly when the French similarly rule Morocco. Much the same may be said in regard to the trade of Italy with French North Africa. As regards concessions: it strikes me from actual observation that there are not a few British concessionaire companies in Algeria and Tunis engaged in boring for oil, in digging phosphates, in lead, zinc, and iron mining operations, and in varied manufactures.

French people who discuss in an informal way this question of Morocco and of German claims to free-trade treatment, profess to believe that if France pledged herself, in return for an admitted political control over the greater part of Morocco, to maintain indefinitely a free-trade *régime* in that region, it would hamper her position in Algeria and Tunis and make it difficult for her to maintain any Protectionist policy in those countries, since goods entering Morocco under a free-trade treatment might so easily penetrate across the Sahara frontier into Algeria and Tunis.

[3] At present France and the French Empire do an annual trade with Algeria and Tunis of a combined approximate value of 31,000,000*l.* (taking the figures of 1908 as a sample): the German trade with French North Africa for the same annual period is only about 673,000*l.*; that of Italy about 1,400,000*l.*

[4] The approximate value of the trade between the British Empire and Algeria and Tunis for 1909 was 2,300,000*l.*, nearly twice as much as in 1880; British trade with Morocco for the year 1907 was about 1,714,000*l.* in value; French trade with Morocco for the same period was 1,635,000*l.*; German trade with Morocco for 1907 was 652,000*l.* The total value of the trade of Morocco with the outside world in the year 1908 was approximately 5,600,000*l.* in value. Yet Morocco has an area of about 219,000 square miles and a population of at least 5,000,000. The area of settled Northern Algeria (distinct in administration from Southern or Saharan Algeria) is 184,500 square miles, and its population is about 4,800,000; but after eighty years of French rule there less than five millions of Algerians do a trade with the outside world of an annual value of about 31,000,000*l.*

Personally, this seems to me a foolish argument. Morocco is under a free-trade *régime* at the present day, but the French hold in force the eastern frontier regions of Morocco, and the amount of goods which evade Algerian customs duties and penetrate into that country or into Tunis cannot, from the miserable conditions of transport, bring any appreciable loss to French revenues or commercial interests. Moreover, a provincial feeling is arising in both Algeria and Tunis which is resenting with ever-increasing strength the holding in tutelage of those countries to French merchants and capitalists, and this feeling is the more noteworthy since it is voiced chiefly by Frenchmen or colonists of French descent who are asking that Algeria and Tunis may have free trade and unfettered steam transport with all the world. A bitter feeling is arising as to the poor speed, poor accommodation, and other defects in the lines of French steamers which connect the Algerian and Tunisian coasts with the South of France, and when I was in North Africa in the early part of the present year I noted with some surprise the exaggerated enthusiasm with which the French colonists of Tunis and Algeria welcomed in their Press the establishment or extension of German lines connecting North Africa with Genoa. I believe myself that what remains of protection and privilege for French commerce and French capital in Algeria and Tunis is on the road to extinction, and that these countries will prosper so greatly under a complete *régime* of free trade that not only will their loyalty to the French nation increase, but their very prosperity will indirectly enrich France in many ways, while it will greatly add to her power in Europe.

Meantime, the position is this, that Great Britain has received compensation for any harm which may come to her commerce by the establishment of French rule over Morocco, while Germany has not; and the plea of previous articles of mine in this Review has been that, for the sake not only of the world's peace but of the development of the world's resources in barbarous countries, the position of Germany and of German commerce should receive the most careful attention at the hands of the other Great Powers, in order that Germany might receive fair play and be deprived of any inducement to disturb the world's peace by assertions of fair or of unsatisfied claims.

But in addition to this, any impartial student of North African affairs, of the North African past and present, must feel impelled to make an appeal to the most highly educated nation in the world —Germany—for sympathy and even indulgence in regard to the French position in North Africa.

Let us consider a brief summary of what France has done in these regions since 1830. She found Algeria in this condition. A

Dey [5] of Turkish descent ruled at Algiers and along the coast for a hundred miles or so on either side of that town. He maintained his power chiefly by the aid of Turkish soldiery, and raided and robbed the Berber inhabitants of the interior wherever he was strong enough to do so. Another Turkish Dey resided at Oran and governed the coastline between Mostaganem and the Morocco frontier, and inland as far as Tlemcen. On the east of the Algiers Deylik there was an independent Turkish Bey at Constantine, who controlled the coast between Philippeville and the Tunisian frontier. The Regency of Tunis was the hereditary sovereignty of a Turkish prince or Bey who was in somewhat nearer relations of suzerainty with the Sultan at Constantinople. These Turkish princes merely governed the littoral and held a few strong and ancient towns in the interior. Elsewhere the Berber and Arab tribes were more or less independent, and those of nomadic habits were constantly raiding the settled agriculturists, hindering all progress, incidentally aiding the advance of the sandy desert, keeping down population and allowing their flocks and herds to destroy the forests and thereby lessen the rainfall and humidity. The condition of Algeria and Tunis in 1830 was lamentable, and offered the most striking contrast to the times of the Roman or even Byzantine Empire, when North Africa far down into the Sahara Desert, and especially along the Mediterranean coasts, was almost crowded with stone-built towns and possessed quite a number of magnificent cities, the public buildings of which—as may be seen by their surviving ruins—vied in architecture and beauty with those of Italy. The water supply was carefully preserved and was utilised for the maintenance of a prosperous agriculture and horticulture. Roads traversed Algeria, Tunisia, and parts of Morocco in all directions. Wild elephants still existed and were frequently tamed and exported to Europe, whilst their ivory was an article of commerce. Much of Morocco, it is true, remained a savage country; yet it does not seem to have been as markedly hostile to European penetration as at the present day, and the forests of the Atlas furnished a good deal of timber to the Roman world. In Algeria and Tunis there were fewer swamps and arid tracts than there are now (still more was this the case in comparison to 1830), and consequently the country was far more densely populated and seems to have had little or no malaria.

The first blow to the prosperity of Roman Africa came from the

[5] 'Dey' was a cant soldier's term in Turkish for 'uncle,' and was applied by the janissaries to the leader or representative whom they elected (at first an elderly man) to represent their interests in the government of these pirate States. In the seventeenth century this nominee of the Turkish soldiery, among whom there were very many European renegades, displaced the Pasha sent from Constantinople and became sole ruler. The same was the case with the military Beys of Tunis and Constantine.

invasion of the Vandals, but this damage was repaired by the Byzantine conquest. The Arab invasions of 648 and 669-88 dealt undoubtedly a deadly blow at Roman civilisation between Tangier and Tripoli, yet in time there was a certan recovery; checked again by the 'Hilalian'[6] Arab invasion of the middle eleventh century, by the widespread ravages of a plague (coming from Egypt) in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the irruption into Morocco and Western Algeria of the negroid Murabitin (Al Moravides) in the eleventh century. Yet there was a great revival of civilisation of a Roman type once more under the Berber dynasties between Morocco and Tripoli, a civilisation no doubt mainly inspired by Moorish Spain and lasting until the arrival of the fatal Turks in the middle of the sixteenth century. With the Turkish invasion of Algeria, Tunis and Tripoli at that period began three centuries of misery and degradation for North Africa, while at the same time the de-civilisation of Morocco commenced and continued under the present Sharifian dynasty, a dynasty which came from the south—Sus and Tafilalt—and which negrified Morocco by its conquest of the Western Sudan and its importation of negro troops and negro slaves into Morocco.

In Algeria France has drained innumerable swamps and planted millions of hectares of barren land. The climate here and there has become more humid, and therefore has made agriculture or stock-rearing more possible or profitable, and is far more healthy for Europeans and natives than it was seventy years ago. There are districts at the present day regarded as sanatoria which, in the remembrance of the writer of this article, were seriously unhealthy in 1880. Far down in the Sahara Desert artesian wells have tapped the underground water-supply which percolates through so much of that seemingly hopeless area. This has led to a great increase in barley cultivation and in the growth of date palms, and consequently of the indigenous population of Berbers and Arabs. The extinction of the lion, finally achieved about 1888—regrettable though it may be from a naturalist's point of view—and the considerable diminution in numbers of the large panthers, the chitas, and hyenas, have also operated favourably on the keeping of live stock. The French have battled with the locusts on a heroic scale, and in many parts of Algeria this once constant plague has become nothing more than a tradition, a remembrance of the bad old times in the minds of the middle-aged or old. Districts which I saw as blank, hopeless, sandy desert in 1880 were flourishing gardens or orchards when I revisited them in 1897-8

[6] A term now much in use by French historians to describe the considerable 'Arabising' of Northern Africa which occurred during the eleventh century, due to the invasion of the Sahara and Mauretania by the Arab tribes of the Beni-Hilal and the Beni-Soleim.

or in 1911—growing oranges, figs, dates, pomegranates, lentils, barley, lucerne, and caroubs. Good carriageable roads where not one carriageable road existed in 1830 have been made throughout Algeria to the extent of about 1900 miles and extending as far south as Wargla in the Sahara Desert. In Tunisia in 1880 there were about 150 miles of carriageable roads. At the present date this French protectorate has about 1800 miles of well-made roads over which horse-carriages, motors and bicycles can pass with ease and comfort. In the wilder regions of the Regency excellent rest-houses for natives and for Europeans—clean, comfortable, and safe, and with simple wholesome food for men and forage for beasts—are maintained by the Tunisian Government. In 1880 I was unable to travel anywhere in Tunis at any distance from the principal towns without an escort, special permission and special facilities. At the present day Tunisia is as safe and as open to tourists as France itself, while, of course, the same thing can be said not only of Algeria but of all those frontier regions in the east and south of Morocco which are in French occupation. The beautiful and picturesque oasis of Figuig in south-eastern Morocco, the reaching of which some ten years ago would have been a feat almost deserving a minor reward of a geographical society and which would have occupied some three weeks from London or Paris, is now a steamer and railway journey from either of those capitals of no more than five or four days, and requires no special permission or any more foresight than the writing a day or two beforehand to the comfortable Hôtel du Sahara to secure rooms. Six hundred and seventy miles of railways have been constructed in Tunisia and over 2000 miles in Algeria, and on the whole these railways, if not as speedy, are actually more comfortable in average accommodation than the railways of Sussex and Kent. No town of Algeria or Tunis is without its one or more hotels, and the food, accommodation, and moderate prices of these establishments are deserving of well-merited praise in the tourist world. In fact, if Marseilles were a better-organised port than it is, and the direct steamship lines between Marseilles, Algeria and Tunis provided swifter and larger boats, with better accommodation and better food, Algeria and Tunis should absorb a large proportion of those European tourists who between October and April travel in search of sunshine and flowers.

A glance at commercial statistics will show how the trade of Europe and the United States has increased with French North Africa during the last thirty years. No Congo policy has been followed here. The land has not been taken away from the indigenes, who continue to possess their due proportion of it and who have long since come to feel a marked confidence in the justice of the French courts, or, as in Tunis, in their native tribunals.

reformed and controlled as these are by French oversight. The position of the Jews has entirely changed since the arrival of the French. They are now on the same footing as Europeans, and consequently of late years have shown a marked improvement in morale, in education, and in physique. Under the direct encouragement of France, something like 295,000 colonists of French descent exist in Algeria and are at last beginning to prosper.[7] About 35,000 French men and women are now established in Tunis, in which country also Italian immigration instead of diminishing has increased since the establishment of the French protectorate and can now show a total of something like 84,000 colonists. There are also 11,000 Maltese living happily and safely in the same region. In Algeria there are 40,000 Italians and 10,000 Maltese, more especially in the eastern part, besides another 30,000 or so Italians and Maltese that have become French citizens and a part of the French-speaking community. In the western parts of Algeria there are 160,000 Spaniards, and another 40,000 colonists of Spanish descent who are naturalised French citizens. An increasing proportion of the Spaniards in Algiers are becoming French subjects, and their children, I have noticed, are bi-lingual, speaking French with as much fluency as Spanish. No matter what gibes may be cast by French and English at the somewhat barbarous manners of the Spaniards of Oran or the Italians of Bone, it is clear to the present writer that the children and the descendants of these other Latin colonists are rapidly assimilating in character with those of French descent, and before more than one or two generations are past will, together not only with the Jews, but even a proportion of the Berber population, become fused into a homogeneous French-speaking population of North Africa.

The French of late have done much not only to realise the importance of the Berber element in North Africa and the great difference of character and value between the Berber and the Arab, but to bring home these differences to the Berbers themselves and induce them, as far as their unhappy attachment to Islam permits, to throw in their lot with that of the European world in the future. In Tunis and in Western Algeria the practice of monogamy is spreading amongst the Berbers, always well inclined to it in principle; for amongst the unspoilt Berber peoples woman holds a far higher position than among the Arabs or Turks.

[Quite the unhappiest thing that ever happened to North Africa was the Muhammadan conquest in the seventh and eighth

[7] In 1861, there were 112,229 French settlers and 80,517 Italians, Spaniards, Maltese, Germans, and Swiss—192,746 European colonists, as against about 680,500 in 1907.

centuries. But for the religious barrier thus created the civilising work of Rome would have been continued over all this region without check. One hundred years hence, when we are—all over the world—much wiser than at the present day, it will be realised that one of the most disastrous episodes in human history was the uprising and the success of Muhammad.]

Islamic fanaticism still attains its culmination in the western and eastern extremes of the Muhammadan world; in Morocco and in Afghanistan. In Tunis, perhaps owing to the deep-seated influence of Rome in this most Roman part of Africa, there has never been quite the same hatred of Christian Europe and Christian civilisation as elsewhere in North Africa; and since 1881 the peaceful penetration of France and her wise and well-planned measures for the administration of the country and its restoration to prosperity, have been little, if at all, opposed or interfered with by Muhammadan fanaticism. But in Algeria the struggle has been long and obstinate and is still not at an end, though there has been a perceptible amelioration since the beginning of the twentieth century. Mons. Edmond Doutté in his exceedingly interesting work on Morocco, published in 1905,[8] points out that, in spite of optimism based on consciousness of well-doing, Frenchmen would be rash in concluding that their presence in Algeria or Morocco was really desired by the Muhammadan natives of those countries, still less that there was any widespread wish on the part of the Moroccans for a French protectorate. He points out, for example, how unpopular for a long time was the law of compulsory vaccination in Algeria, though its steady maintenance has almost extirpated smallpox from that region. The Algerians believe it to be a crafty plan for sterilising them sexually and thus arresting their increase! Though if they glanced at statistics they would see that under French rule the native population has increased from 2,340,000 in 1861 to 4,418,000 in 1907. The laws for the establishment of personal property, for the registration of births, deaths, marriages, and testamentary dispositions, for taking a census of the population, for establishing insurance and mutual-benefit societies—in fact, every measure to increase the welfare of the masses—were viewed at first and for long with the profoundest suspicion. Even yet, in such of the Muhammadan schools of Algeria as are not under the control of the French Government, the pupils are taught systematically that the Christian is trying to warp their social life into a denial of Islam and consequently

[8] *Merrakech*, published by the Comité du Maroc, Paris. Two other books on the present condition of Morocco well worth reading are: *Morocco of To-day*, by Eugène Aubin: J. M. Dent, 1906; and *Les Confins Algéro-Marocains*, par Augustin Bernard: Paris, Emile Larose, 1911.

is bringing them within danger of Hell-fire in the next world. Yet Mons. Doutté, whom I met at Algiers at the beginning of this year, has written his definite conviction 'that a slow but sure movement is growing which draws us and our Moslem fellow-citizens in Algeria together into a community of feeling, and that this movement is undoubtedly strengthened by the good administrative measures of recent years. It is a movement which cannot be hastened by impatient advances on our part, nor can it be seriously delayed by the existing fanaticism of middle-aged Muhammadans, but it is as irresistible as the progress of a glacier. . . . Actually our entry into Algeria, by the suspicion and terror of the foreigner which it aroused, hastened or accentuated the Islamising of not a few Berber peoples and tribes who had hitherto almost remained in a pagan state, while it sharpened the fanaticism of the Muhammadans in the great towns of Algeria and Morocco.' In his book on *Merrakech* (Morocco) Mons. Doutté gives a number of illustrations of the way in which Muhammadans in Algeria and Morocco still seek to express their hatred or contempt for the Christian; how in their answers they almost invariably evade the reply of 'Peace be on you' to the Christian's polite greeting, the struggle being especially to avoid the use of the word *salam* (peace). In letters this is sometimes written indistinctly so that it may read *semm*, which means 'poison,' or the phrase used is 'Peace on those . . . who follow the true religion.'

Of late years French travellers and officials have noted a revival of Muhammadan fanaticism on the Tunisian borders and in Morocco; and they have not hesitated to charge Turkey with being the direct inspirer of this renewed hatred of the Christian, and have even bitterly reflected on Germany as the instigator for her own purposes of Turkey, especially under the Hamidian *régime*, and quite recently (1910) under the Young Turkey renaissance. That there were *agents provocateurs* coming from Turkish Tripoli into French Tunis some twelve years ago, I am able to confirm with my own observations when travelling then in the extreme south of Tunisia. A little later on a well-known German official in the Levant certainly went to indiscreet lengths in the Tripolitaine, in Egypt, and in Syria, in inflaming Turkish and Arab opinion against both France and England, and suggesting that the real friend of Islam was Germany, and that under German protection Islam might regain the empire of its palmy days. How much of the accusations levelled against this official was true I am unable to say, but that the impression was given about five years ago, from Morocco to the Euphrates, that Germany was about to champion the cause of Islam against the other European Powers, I am fully aware from my own experiences in

travel. If the high authorities of the German Empire counselled any such methods on the part of their minor agents in the Eastern world, no doubt it was in pursuance of some German interest or ambition, and they were no more blameworthy in that direction than the governing authorities of Great Britain when they have allowed people to blacken the character of the French, the Boers, or the Portuguese when at issue with those nationalities. Yet I question the prudence of the pro-Islamic attitude attributed to German policy in 1905-6 and in 1910, for I believe that in all world-questions, such as the support or otherwise of Islamic fanaticism, Germany must be *solidaire* in her interests with the rest of Christian Europe. Any such weapon as she might forge for the injury of Britain or France in Africa might be turned against herself to-day in Africa or later in Western Asia.

France in North Africa is in the main carrying out the purpose and subserving the interests of civilised Europe, just as Germany or Austro-Germany is doing and may be doing the same in other regions at present undeveloped and barely civilised. France may have made, and may still be making, mistakes in her policy, commercial, fiscal, or administrative. These are much more easily pointed out and remedied by explanations than by spokes placed between the wheels. Personally, I take as keen an interest in the gains to science and civilisation which are accruing, and are likely to accrue, from German colonial developments and enterprise in foreign countries as I do in those which are under the flag of my own country or that of France; but I do not feel that German ambitions will in the long run be benefited by increasing the difficulties which France already finds in her path in the restoration of North Africa to civilisation. I imagine that all students of science and world-citizens would like to see France given a very free hand in the North of Africa, so that she might not only repair the ravages of the Arab and the Turk, but fight Nature herself, and by means of railways, artesian wells, and the establishment of law and order, restore large portions of the Sahara Desert to the habitable condition in which they were at no very remote period in the ancient history of Man.

H. H. JOHNSTON.

ELIZABETHAN DRAMA IN THE MAKING

THE average English reader of serious literature, who combines with a smattering of Shakespeare some recollections of the writings of a few of the other dramatists of his period, would no doubt be much perplexed were he to be told that our chief and most reliable informant on the subject of the drama, the playwrights and the history of the Stage in England at that time was an illiterate person of a business turn of mind who devoted himself in the course of a somewhat diversified commercial career to the occupations of a dyer, a pawnbroker, a starch-manufacturer, a timber-merchant, a dealer in real estate and a stage-manager, during the last years of Elizabeth's reign, and for sixteen years of the following century. And yet, as a matter of fact, such was the man that Philip Henslowe was, and such the nature and importance of the ill-written but invaluable manuscript that has reached us from his hands.

Within its time-worn and occasionally mutilated pages which have been lying for some three hundred years in Dulwich College, there is to be found a contemporaneous and accurate account of the manner in which a vast number of the great dramas of England's Augustan age were composed, the curious conditions attending their composition, the strange collaboration which in many cases led to their production, and the actual dates on which a great number of them were staged for the first time before the theatre-going public of the day; together with a crowd of other scraps of information connected with theatrical life and living outside and inside the tiring-room in that wonderful age, when our dawning literature had sprung, as the young lark springs from the mountain grass, into an adolescence of perfect music, which three centuries of education and advancing knowledge have not enabled us to surpass.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the newspaper-reading public of our time possess a fuller acquaintance with the manners and customs of the Egyptians of Pharaoh's day than they do with the records to be found in this extraordinary volume, which is lying within our easy reach, and has long been known as *Henslowe's Diary*. Many learned students of Shakespeare's period